

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

claims 32-34 define the session parameters as including supported codec information regarding one or more codecs supported by each terminal and multiplexing scheme information indicating how plural information streams can be multiplexed in different ways into a single bitstream to be transmitted over a physical channel established between the terminals for the session.

Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 17-26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by Altschuler. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 17, and 31 are concerned with a communication between two terminals that have differentiated capabilities, which requires the determination of common multimedia session parameters depending on the specific capabilities of the two terminals for multimedia communication. Both terminals must use the common multimedia session parameters in order to execute the multimedia session and exchange multimedia content.

Altschuler discloses a communication setup method for automatically initiating a secure call setup procedure for a local terminal and a remote terminal if the remote terminal's number or network address is included in an "approved list" 44 at the local terminal. The approved list is created manually by the user of the terminal, see column 4, lines 11-25. If a current user-identity of the remote terminal corresponds to a user-identity in the approved list, an "abbreviated" secure call setup process is performed, see abstract and steps 74 and 80 in Figure 6. This abbreviated setup process is described in Fig. 8 and columns 9-10 and omits the public key encryption steps in the full secure call setup process described in Fig. 7 and col. 9, lines 33-47.

Altschuler's automatic initiation of a secure call setup procedure based on the presence of a user-identity in a manually created "approved list" for encryption is different from determining multimedia session parameters relating to terminal multimedia communication capabilities. Altschuler also does not disclose the claim feature of determining whether any multimedia session parameters related to terminal multimedia communication capabilities for a previous session between the same terminals have been stored. Nor does Altschuler disclose the claim features of retrieving the stored session parameters and executing the requested multimedia session based on those session parameters. Another significant difference is that the claimed technology does not require the user to create an approved list or similar for call setups.

In the first action, the Examiner seemed to equate Altschuler's encryption steps with determining the claimed multimedia session parameters. But in this final action, the Examiner states that Altschuler lacks "connection with said previous session, by using at least one available session key that has been selected for said previous session and stored together with said session parameters, and if said common session parameters have been stored in both the calling and the called terminals." Initially, Applicants point out that this is not an accurate characterization of the claim language missing from Altschuler.

The newly-applied Sinnarajah discloses using a "previously stored service configuration" in a call-setup procedure. The Examiner relies on section [0024] of Sinnarajah between a mobile station and a base station. See [0004] "[c]all setup is the process of establishing dedicated physical channels and negotiating service configuration parameters between a mobile station and a base station so that communication can take place." [0024] confirms this: "Service Connect Message 10 is delivered from the base station to the mobile station to end any negotiation." That negotiation is not between two user terminals as in the claims which are directed to the matching

of multimedia capabilities in the two terminals to enable a multimedia communication session between them.

On page 15 of the office action, the Examiner indicates that the distinctions based on multimedia session parameters relating to multimedia communication capabilities of the two terminals argued in the previous response were not weighted because these features were set forth in the preamble of the independent claim rather than in the body. While Applicants submit that the features in the preamble were limiting because they are referenced in the body of the claim, the independent claims are amended to include these features in the body of the claim. For example, the preamble of claim 1 now recites: “[a] method of establishing a requested multimedia communication session over a given physical channel between a calling terminal and a called terminal having differentiated capabilities,” and the first step in the body of the claim is now “determining common multimedia session parameters to be used by both the calling terminal and the called terminal during the multimedia session that define how multimedia information should be communicated and interpreted and which depend on multimedia communication capabilities of the calling and called terminals before the session can be executed.” Neither Altschuler nor Sinnarajah teach this step.

Nor do they teach determining whether any common session parameters for a previous multimedia communication session between the calling and called terminals have been stored in both the calling and the called terminals in connection with the previous session. Applicants also are not certain whether either reference teaches the claims “at least one available session key that has been selected for said previous session and stored together with said session parameters” or “retrieving the stored common session parameters in each of the terminals by using said at least

one session key in order to execute the requested session based on the retrieved session parameters.”

So even if Altschuler and Sinnarajah could be combined, for purposes of argument, that combination lacks multiple features recited in the independent claims. Nor would a person of ordinary skill in the art look to the security provisions in Altschuler to solve the problem of avoiding negotiation of multimedia capability session parameters for a multimedia session. Thus, there is no reasonable basis for modifying Altschuler as the Examiner does based on hindsight.

The Examiner relies on the Coulombe reference in combination with Altschuler and Sinnarajah to reject several dependent claims. But Coulombe does not remedy the deficiencies noted with Altschuler and Sinnarajah. Coulombe describes a very different approach than that claimed. Proxy servers not required by the claimed technology are used to receive capability and preference information concerning user agents that want to establish a media session. A proxy server compares the capabilities of the user agents and determines whether an incompatibility exists between them. If so, the proxy server uses an adaptation server to provide the necessary adaptation required to allow the media session to proceed. Rather than the end users negotiating common session parameters that they both can support, Coulombe uses a special adaptation server to bridge differences in capability. The two approaches are quite different.

Regarding claims 32-34, the common session parameters relate to codecs and multiplexing schemes that must be used by the two terminals. The Examiner includes the Naka reference with Altschuler and Sinnarajah. Naka shows different coding schemes. But the Examiner does not indicate where Naka teaches “wherein the session parameters include supported ... **multiplexing scheme information indicating how plural information streams**


BURMAN ET AL.
Appl. No. 10/581,320
February 24, 2010

can be multiplexed in different ways into a single bitstream to be transmitted over a physical channel established between the terminals for the session.”

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100